



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

We hope Dr. Cosenza will give us more of his Petrarch studies, and that in his future translations freedom, so commendable in general, may be only the mask, behind which lurk the uncompromising features of rigorous method<sup>1</sup>.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

FRANK GARDNER MOORE.

Syntax of Early Latin. Vol. I. The Verb. By Charles E. Bennett. Boston: Allyn and Bacon (1910). Pp. xix + 506. \$4.00.

Almost fifty years have passed since the publication of the last comprehensive work on the syntax of Early Latin—F. W. Holtze's *Syntaxis priscorum scriptorum Latinorum usque ad Terentium*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1861-1862). This was supplemented in 1882, soon after the author's death, by his *Syntaxis fragmentorum scaenicorum poetarum Romanorum qui post Terentium fuerunt adumbratio*, a pamphlet of seventy-eight pages. In fifty years the syntactical monographs devoted to the Latin of the early period have multiplied enormously and scholars have been forced either to use these monographs directly—and they are often difficult to secure—or to be content with the necessarily brief treatments of the early period contained in such general works as Schmalz's *Syntax* in I. Mueller's *Handbuch*, Volume 2, the new but still incomplete *Historische Grammatik* of Stolz, Landgraf, and others (1894-1908), Volume 3, or the syntactical notes in such standard editions of the early writers as Brix's plays of Plautus (revised by Niemeyer), Dziatzko's Terence (revised by Hauler and Kauer), Vahlen's Ennius, F. Marx's Lucilius, etc. Even the professed treatments of the syntax of single writers, e. g. E. Ballas, *Grammatica Plautina* (1884), Sven Tessing, *Syntaxis Plautina* (1892), Lindsay, *Syntax of Plautus* (1907), have dealt with small parts of the subject or have been mere outlines. All scholars, therefore—especially those who have not had ready access to a good library—have long wished for a general work on early Latin syntax which should summarize the labors of specialists during the last half-century, provide a good bibliography, and present a full selection of the material. Professor Bennett is earning the gratitude of Latin scholars by his effort to perform a task the mere labor of which would dismay most men; and this remains true no matter how one may criticize the finished product, for the material is in general richly presented and the bibliography will lead the reader to good monographs.

If the book were a mere summary of the material and results of the countless special works on which it is based, it would be of very great value. But it is no mere summary. Everywhere one finds evi-

dence of independent scrutiny of the facts by a scholar who is himself a specialist in Latin syntax. In fact the personality of the author pervades the book to a degree quite exceptional in a work of this character and lends to it a vigor and a life which render it always interesting whether one agrees or disagrees with the views expressed. Nor has Professor Bennett's critical attitude been limited to an evaluation of the material and results of others. He has himself collected or re-collected material whenever he has failed to find adequate monographs. His work, therefore, often assumes the character of an independent investigation.

In the preface, which occupies but little more than a page, there are some statements which are misleading and need expansion. In his definition of Early Latin Professor Bennett says that Holtze's work ended with Terence. He might at least have alluded to the same scholar's posthumous work the title of which has been given above. Scholars will not quarrel with the later limit, about 100 B. C., set for Early Latin, but it is not true that if the scope of the work had been extended for another quarter of a century, "the additions would have been insignificant—merely a few citations from the Sullan annalists and contemporary inscriptions". If the remains of the language down to 75 B. C.—a date which Professor Bennett himself mentions—had been considered, it would have been necessary to study the Auctor ad Herennium, to say nothing of the earliest orations of Cicero. Specialists will, of course, know this, but it is to be hoped that the book will be used not by specialists alone.

The texts to which Professor Bennett refers in citing his material are not always the best available. The *Fragmenta poetarum Romanorum* of Aemilius Baehrens, for example, offers if possible a less reliable text than the other editions of the same editor and is out of print besides. Probably Professor Bennett chose this book for reasons of convenience, but in cases where the fragments of single poets have been well edited in separate form, as in Vahlen's Ennius and Marx's Lucilius, it would have been better to abandon Baehrens. This criticism would have less weight, if care had been taken to correct the text of Baehrens when it is wrong, but a comparison of citations as they appear in the texts of Baehrens and Vahlen or Baehrens and Marx will show that such corrections have not been made with any consistency.

The classification of material, which is summarized in an admirably full and clear table of contents, is as far as possible formal. This is always true of the main rubrics and is applied in as great detail as possible to the subdivisions. Chapter III, for example, is entitled *The Indicative in Subordinate Clauses* (here the classification is formal). The first subdivision is *Conditional Sentences* (the classi-

<sup>1</sup>It seems worth while to refer here particularly to an interesting book—Petrarch, *The First Modern Scholar and Man of Letters*, by J. H. Robinson and H. W. Rolfe (G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1898, 436 pages).

fication is now functional). Then follow Indicative Protases (formal) classified according to the tense used in the protasis (formal). In the same way the Temporal Clauses (functional) are subdivided into clauses introduced by *ubi, quando, ut*, etc. (formal). In a work of this kind one must come ultimately to function, but it is better to apply a formal classification just as far as possible. Professor Bennett's separation of subordinate clauses in the indicative from those in the subjunctive has necessitated also a separation of material that might have been treated under one head. For example, one is forced to examine different chapters to find all the cases of conditional usage, although most of the material could have been grouped in one place if a classification based on introducing particles had been adopted. It is open to question, however, whether the results would have been any better than at present. All systems have their defects.

ARTHUR L. WHEELER.

Bryn Mawr College.

(To be continued.)

Theocritus in English Literature. By Robert T. Kerlin. Yale Dissertation (1906). Lynchburg, Va.: J. P. Bell Co. (1910). Pp. 203. \$1.50.

This is a unique and thoroughgoing investigation into the influence of Theocritus upon English literature. The author has treated all notices, imitations, comments, translations or paraphrases of Theocritus, from the earliest, in Skelton (1523), down to 1906. It is much more than a mere list that he gives us; the running comment and evaluation makes it very interesting reading. He deals with such topics as pastoral poetry, Theocritus's place in the world's literature, pastoral drama, piscatory and town eclogues, down through the recognized periods of literature in England, and ends with a chapter on Theocritus in America. Appendices, bibliography, and index complete the volume.

Interesting is a quotation (p. 82) from a letter of Anna Seward to Richard Polwhele, Dec. 27, 1785; she says she should as soon "expect a roast phenix for dinner, as that fifty people in this nation would willingly purchase a new translation of writers so little known as either Horace or Theocritus". Until recently, Theocritus has never been widely known, or often translated; Dr. Kerlin gives this summary of translations by centuries (p. 167): "Sixteenth: 1 author, 6 versions [= Idyls]. Seventeenth: 6 authors, 15 versions. Eighteenth: 12 authors, 14 versions. Nineteenth: 19 authors, 49 versions. The numerous translations of passages into sonnets, pictures, etc., occur in the last century". Idyl 19 (Love's Theft of Honey) has been translated oftener than any other, eleven times (yet it probably is not by Theocritus himself); next comes Idyl 11 (The Cyclops in Love), eight times; then Idyl 2 (Simae-

thas's Incantations), six versions. Idyls 15 (The Syracusan Women) and 21 (The Fishermen—non-Theocritean) have five versions each—of course outside of translations of the whole of Theocritus.

Noteworthy are the results from the Victorian era, considering the scant influence Theocritus exercised earlier: "The frequency with which the name of Theocritus occurs in verse during the period, the large number of poems addressed to him, the two prose and the two verse translations, besides numerous partial versions, and the traces of his mode of expression in much of the best poetry of the time, together with the fresh and appreciative essays on his genius, testify that Theocritus has come at last to be a really considerable force in English literature" (p. 139).

Similarly, for America (p. 165): "The younger American singers, whatever their merits, have paid more tributes to Theocritus than to any other ancient poet. . . . There is in much of their verse the lilt of true song, the throb of joy, the melody of self-prompted singing. . . . The best of these have tried to imitate his realism, and to catch his simple graces".

We are grateful that the author has quoted freely from many of the recent verses dedicated to Theocritus by Englishmen and Americans alike. Wilde's Villanelle and Dobson's (1880) are given entire; also Langhorne's Theocritus! Theocritus! what pleasant dreams were thine (1846); Lang's To Theocritus in Winter (1879); Egan's Sonnet (1880); Gosse's The poplars and the ancient elms (1880); McCarthy's Sonnet (to Calverley, 1884); Lewisohn's In Sicily (1906). This bringing together, in this connection, of widely scattered verse, is delightful.

The material here presented ought to be invaluable to the next editor of Theocritus—and an American edition is badly needed. All lovers of Theocritus must be grateful to Dr. Kerlin for this laborious task, so well accomplished. It should serve as an incentive to similar work for other authors; a similar investigation for Catullus would be especially welcome<sup>1</sup>.

ARTHUR WINFRED HODGMAN.

Ohio State University.

Two books of interest in connection with the teaching of elementary Latin have appeared within this year. The first, entitled Latin for Beginners, is by Professor B. L. D'Ooge, of the State Normal School, Ypsilanti, Michigan, (Ginn & Co.). The other, A Latin Primer, is by H. C. Nutting, Professor in the University of California, (The American Book Company). Professor Nutting plans to publish A First Latin Reader; the Primer and the Reader will together cover First Year Latin. Both books will be reviewed before long in these pages.

<sup>1</sup>This book was noticed in The Nation on February 9. In The Nation for April 20, in a brief letter, Mr. Alfred G. Langley, of Newport, calls attention to "the fine paper, Tennyson and Theocritus, in Steadman's Victorian Poets, 6.201-233 (edition of 1875)". This essay, says Mr. Langley, shows clearly that Theocritus was known and appreciated in America earlier than Mr. Kerwin maintained.